

Infallibility

by Fr Peter Little SJ

{What is infallibility and inspired?}

... Is it inspired? Is it Infallible? Alright. Is it infallible first and then inspired or inspired and therefore must be infallible? Now it must be infallible. Who am I to contradict the doctor? Now the councils of the church are they inspired? Yes, the Second Vatican Council, is that inspired? Is it infallible? There is the Third Vatican Council with the prime infallibility. Is it infallible? Is it inspired? [1.00]

There's the encyclical, Humane Vitae. Is it inspired? Is it infallible? In other words, we all know the words, but I used to find when I was in the seminary. Seminarians all learn the words. And you'd ask them during an exam to answer questions, and they just hope to God, that's how I'd envisage it, that by putting all the words together, somehow or other, there'd be a bit of truth in it and you'd get marks. And I used to call them porridge answers. Put everything in and hoped it would come out nicely. In other words, we do know a lot of words, but you suddenly find when you're put on the spot, you mightn't be quite sure what they mean. So before I, where is my paper. You just talk about yourselves now, those questions I asked you, are there any more pages left there? There are forty so there just might be enough for everybody. No? Before we read that then we might just have to clear up a couple of terms [2.03]

{Sacred Scriptures}

The Catholic Church teaches, otherwise we wouldn't know, that the sacred scriptures are sacred because they are inspired. Now what does it mean? It means we're not doing (broken) but I'll just remind you that the Holy Spirit was so present to the minds of the hundred or so authors, human authors, that they first of all conceived the idea of writing down what they had been saying or writing down something that was coming into their heads or writing down something that they found in their heads after they had read other big books. Anyway, the Holy Spirit was there in moving them to desire to put down in writing. And then he was so present to their minds that they did put down in writing in apt and suitable words, there could be mistakes of grammar or differences of style. What? So that they put down and said things [3.01] So that whatever they intend to say in what they wrote they might write poems or love songs, riddles, stories, accounts of history denunciations of Jerusalem or whatever. Whatever they intended to mean and say when they wrote down was exactly what the Holy Spirit wanted said, no more and no less. Now that's a profound mystery of course how that happened, that's the dogma of inspiration. Now the only things inspired in that sense are the sacred scriptures of the old and the new testaments, nothing else at all. Because God had to give his divine revelation to us in a written form as well as in a living form otherwise we'd forget it. So he brought about a communication of himself and his plan, that's what divine revelation covers. Him and his plan for us. Who he is and who we are that's what it is. Now that's a living thing. And it came to a great climax [4.01] in Our Lord who now heads the Catholic Church that's the fullness of divine revelation. But the written form of it, explanatory of it showing its demands is to be entrusted to writing otherwise from the human point of view we'd

forget so much of it, so it's written down for us.

{Infallibility}

Now the next thing is that there is divine assistance given to those in the church entrusted with the government of the church and the safeguarding of the scriptures and so on. Now that assistance can reach to various, come to various levels. The Holy Spirit is always there seeing that Our Lord is always in the Church, the great community of the catholic religion from Pentecost till the end of time. He is there. There you see its not obvious that he's there. He is there and he is there as the Spirit breathing Lord. [5.01] And so he breathes the Holy Spirit, for various purposes, into the church. Basically to keep it in communion. And then to make sure that they all have that divine revelation in their minds and the same impulse of charity in their hearts. How does he achieve it? That's what we'll see. And then that presence there bringing about an assistance of the Holy Spirit means the assistance will be given. And it won't be over given, it'll always be there but it won't be given more than is necessary. But the Church knows and has held and has defined that that assistance will reach to a level of infallibility and that's what we're going to see. So you've asked a lot of questions. But if your life depended on it or if you had to pay fifty dollars for every wrong question, wrong answer you gave before you left. Would you answer all the questions correctly? See at the end of this whether you [6.00] can correct what you said because some of your answers were correct and some of them were not correct. If you noticed I didn't say "hello, you're right" or "you're wrong", so who was right? And who was wrong? Everyone who kept quiet of course, "well at least I was right." So let's go through this and I've numbered various areas of it so that if you want to ask a question. You could ask a quick question as we go

through. You'd say I don't understand that sentence, and then I might explain it again. But it'll give you a point of reference for the whole business. Now to say that the matter is important would be an understatement. So we'll go through and I hope it gives you at least one useful way of considering the infallibility and authority that's in the catholic church.

{Goal of The Church}

And basically I'd say that (paped) says this; unless we understand the goal in view, the ultimate goal of the church and the immediate goal of authority in the church, we won't appreciate what it's about. [7.03] We might be subject to the terrible onslaught against the authority of the church. That's always gone on, but it seems to have been reaching crisis point a grave crisis point now. Everybody knows there is a grave crisis. This might help to see where it is and how best to deal with it.

{One Long Sunday}

So we are living in a period now, what is it? it's one long Sunday. That's the technical expression from Easter Sunday till Pentecost. Now after Easter Sunday we had a week that was called the octave. That was a kind of daily replay of Easter Sunday. But from Easter Sunday till Pentecost Sunday is called in the church "One Long Sunday" We're to tell you that. It's also the period dedicated to the mystigological catechesis of the neophytes. Say Hello, hello, Carla thinks we're back in Athens in Greece cause they're all Greek words. The neophytes are the newborn; catechesis is the orderly transmission and learning of doctrine. Mystigological is the being led into the mystery. [8.00] The catechumens finalized their preparation from the Vigil of Easter. They

were then baptized, confirmed and took part in the mass; I mean the adult ones did, especially in the mission countries. And they were thus initiated into the paschal mystery of Christ and the Catholic Church. From then till Pentecost they were to get a further formation from the church authorities and personal which is called the mystagogical, that is its now a deep exploration. Its comparable say to coming to Saint Peter's basilica and after a long preparation as you walk down the *dira conciliar* and being debriefed about what you're going to do and see in there. You get to the big piazza, then you get to the steps, then you get to the atrium, the foyer. And you're initiated into, then you get inside, and you say, "gosh they told me about it, but look at it". So the next part is or could be called be compared to the mystagogical period from Easter till Pentecost where you are now exploring what belongs to you. You're in it. [9.03] You've been initiated. They're all new words, we've never heard of this before. But we should all know them backwards because we might run into a catechumen mightn't you. Would you know one if you saw one. You might run into a neophyte. You might even be one.

{The Apocalypse}

Now it's also the time for the annual reading of the apocalypse. A lot of Catholics say "don't talk to me about the apocalypse, I can understand Jesus feeding the bread and wine and the people with bread and fish, but the Apocalypse!" and The Lord Jesus will say "excuse me; I'm the same one who wrote it. I gave the Holy Spirit to John and he wrote the Apocalypse because I wanted it, and its written down, no more and no less", (mumbling) What would you say to him? If he asked you would you do a test on the Apocalypse? What would you say to him? So that's the period we're in now. And what is the

Apocalypse? [10.01] It's for a concentration, by all of us, on the goal of the pilgrimage begun by the newborn as it can be gleaned from Saint John's climactic prophesy building up on something else, an earlier prophesy, as he tells of the growing victory of Christ till the consummation filling out as it were and completing what Our Lord initiated in his discourse just before his passion and what St Peter and St Paul have told us. Now they told us a lot. Remember if you want to find out ask me more about it. Because our very separated brethren in America use this day in and day out. They talk about it on television and on the radio they write comic books, they're always at it. Putting together what Paul and Peter wrote, and John in the Apocalypse. And do they come up with a porridge. It's something like what's true, but it's all over the place. Two people pulled me up outside St John Latin in Rome a mother and her daughter and said "do you know all about Armageddon?". I said "Madam, I've just come from there." Floored them you see, went to Megiddo in the Holy Land, which was Armageddon you see. So she and her Jehovah Witness .. well began to feel a bit shaky. Now why have I given all of this introduction and commented on it a bit? Because all of that is the context for our topic. Only in the light of the church being Christ himself on route to the final manifestation of the victory he achieved on the cross, that's the day of the general resurrection from the dead. And engage in a continuous battle for the triumph of the truth. Can we properly consider authority and infallibility to say nothing of related questions which in one sense are more important, you'll see. In other words we must realize we're engaged in a mighty struggle basically of God against Satan. Better of God made man, who Christ is, against Satan muddled man, which is the world. [12.00] Satan rose in rebellious rejection of the truth. And

though condemned to the perpetual imprisonment of hellfire, he's not there yet, see, he spends all his time involving the human race in the same rebellious rejection. What does God do in order to stem this tidal wave of opposition to him? I'd never thought of that way of putting it til I read Cardinal Newman, that's how he puts it. Magnificent material. Does God say well do I have this, that or the other. No Newman said "Well I'll tell you the sort of thing he would do, he'd have a great voice bellowing out the truth to the human race", and Newman said, "Isn't that strange that's exactly what the church says what she is; the great voice of God bellowing out the truth, and booking no opposition. Won't once consider the slightest opposition to herself. Otherwise if she wasn't there doing that nothing would stop the tidal wave of opposition to God, nothing. So, we must realize this because it's a very important matter. Answer, this is what God does, he [13.01] what does God do? He, I don't know whether the grammar's correct there. He has his son {should be not have}, has his son, the saving Godman, heard the church. Which is, his saved and co-saving embodiment in the global and growing rejection of rebellion. The rebellion of Satan seduced mankind is basically a voiced one. The divinely planned counterstroke will be basically a voiced one. God the spirit breathing father in the spirit breathing son will bind the spirit filled church to himself, and have his voice resound in hers. The neophytes have already heard this voice, but must be strengthened by the gift of the Holy Spirit, so that they can in their turn become part of the speaking church. That's why they've got to be confirmed. Between the resurrection and Pentecost, the [14.00] They must learn how to take their part as confirmed in the battle for the triumph of the truth, through their voice, and the light in harmony with it. They must identify with the truth holding and truth expressing

church, if they're to play their role in the giant enterprise. Remember the background of this too now is that a lot of people aren't doing that at all. Quite the opposite. In the massive struggle to extend the victory of Christ over all hostile forces and into the very fabric of all cultures, in view of the consummation that's coming up, we have to be constantly briefed about the word of God. It's as if we are here in one of the command centers, and are being briefed now concerning this very point. It's a command performance we're all involved in, neophytes and all of us. Not kindergarten games. In wartime Nazi and Communist propaganda seduces many. To defenders of the civilization who engage in the military liberation it looks, the social and political reconstruction must be well briefed about the enemy [15.01] and their own positive goals. Our life in the church is a liberation and a reconstruction operation at the level of the divine with the cosmocrats of darkness, beautiful Greek word, cosmocartoi. Cratoi means ones who have control. Cosmo over cosmas, the cosmos of darkness. So there are beings who are called the cosmocrats. Or the controllers of this world of darkness. That's who the evil spirits are. And our They are the one, they are the enemy par excellence.

{Deposit of Truth}

Question; How do we learn and then speak with our minds attuned to God? Of all the matters that be. I'm vaguely talking about answer. Through a hierarchical transmission of a received deposit of truth. The integral and uncontaminated. Those two adjectives appear all the way through the tradition of the church. [16.01] That what has been transmitted in the beginning is a treasury and body of truth, and it is and will remain integral. Nothing will be taken out of it, and uncontaminated it will not be spoiled by any misunderstanding on the

part of the church. Whereas every group always says the church has either ruined and spoiled the original divine revelation or added to it or taken away from it. Everybody does that. So those two words are of supreme importance. So how has all this got into our minds and we say through hierarchical transmission of a received deposit of truth integral and uncontaminated. That is through teaching by committed. Some of these words and ideas I got from being at a conference of priests in Melbourne last week when we listened to Monsignor Kelly and a monsignor Smith. Two of the giant priests in America. [17.00] On all these matters. And so lots of little bits and pieces I've been putting in, and they would stress it's not enough to have a hierarchy, it must be absolutely committed to carrying out the function assigned to it. So that's why I've put those words in. Through teaching by committed, ministerial, priestly members of Christ, and this next part they insisted on, with an effective method of insistence, backed by sanctions and penalties, of doctrine, teaching doctrine. A doctrine dealing with revealed reality, not just statements. Its statements leading the mind into reality. We believe doctrine, affirmations about the blessed trinity, and that leads the mind straight to the persons of the blessed trinity. Dealing with revealed reality, rooted and grounded in sacred scripture. Clarified by the sacred tradition and taught by the sacred magisterium. Right? Now what's the next bit? Now we see where authority [18.00] and infallibility, with allied matters I've already mentioned, fit in. How do we see how they fit in?

{Heresy}

Well you see if we had Protestants here they'd say, "Oh this is nonsense father. Jesus is the head of the church, he sees to it." Are they right or wrong? Every heresy consists in getting hold of, how do I put it?

i was going to say truth is like a double barreled shotgun. It's ... Truth has always got two components in it that balance. Heresy is always the cutting of the bond between the two truths. Taking one, putting it under a magnifying glass till it fills the whole space allotted, with the other truth being pushed away. It's the exaggeration or the out of focus concentration on one part of a two barreled truth. Two barreled is not the right word, but you see what I mean. So they love the idea of Jesus being the head of the church and the great priest and all this. [19.00] So we see how things fit in. Christ is the royal, priestly and prophetic head of the church. All the Protestants say well even the Roman Catholic's cannon talk sense you see. Because they know that. Through its hierarchical setup. that's where our protestant friends get nervous. Christ who instituted it is with us all days till that great consummation. He's the one heading the priestly worship. He's the one teaching that worshipping and gathered together body of his. He's the one directing it in battle as the king, commander and chief, but how? Through the heads of each local manifestation of the church body of his. They head the worship. You see the bishop, he heads the worship of Sydney, but in his name and person. They teach in his name and person. They rule and direct in his name and person. Question; do they? They're meant to but that's the problem, they're not doing it. [20.00]

{Divine Assistance}

They've almost gone on strike apparently. So we'll see. He commands them to do so, he authorizes them to do so, and he assists them to do so. He structures them as a body of his representatives in structuring the apostolic college. He structures that primordial body, of the apostles, by setting Peter as its head. That body continues on in the body of bishops with Peter still at its head in the Roman line of

successors to Peter. Now Protestants are getting (half state of the mind) got a doctor here to look after them. We all know these things backwards, especially since the Vatican council. But maybe we do need to concentrate on the goal of this structured voice of Christ. See we all learnt these things in school but did we learn why it was there precisely. Alright let's see. It's not there just to be there this great structural organization. Its there to be activated for a purpose. And what is the purpose? [21.00] To ensure the ongoing illumination and inspiration of the people clustered 'round that body of bishops. See the goal is what's going on in the mind and the will of all the people gathered there 'round the bishops. The goal is not that the bishops should say it, the goal is that it should be in the heads of everybody. That's the main thing. You'll see that later on but we just state it here. I'll give a deeper picture of it later. So the ... How does all this happen? By the faithful transmission of the entire situation that Our Lord brought into existence. Well what is that situation? Now remember this is fairly new to most of us. It's simply the situation of the churches being the bride and body of Christ, Holy, with absolute virginal fidelity, at one with Christ in his relationship to the father, in the Holy Spirit. [22.00] The Church is an outward manifestation of the communion of the blessed trinity. If you want to know what the blessed trinity is, the way would be to study the church very carefully, and being aware of all the elements of the church. You'd come to a much richer concept of the divine communion from which the church originates. They think that's going to be the light motif of the apostolic exhortation the pope gives us after the synod on the mission and vocation of the laity, that you'd probably know in a couple of months' time. So the .. This situation, however, is a worshipping situation illuminated by doctrine and

inspired by charity. It's mankind brought into a believing and doctrinal unity for worship. And for worship that leads to the charity of communion. [23.00] That is of communion with the three divine persons that lead in and worship. And with fellow worshippers with all thus committed to the growth of this marvel and mystery and to its animating influence in the whole of human society and the human endeavor. So in view of the great confirmation coming up, you see, Our Lord is planted in the midst of the world, his church and its threefold reality. It's a reality of human beings, you can see it there all through history. I'm just reading Belloc now as he describes the history of England. He has that vision very strongly in his mind, of how the Catholic Church from Rome made itself grow.

{God sustains the Church}

God made it grow of course but through the intense efforts of envoys from Rome. It would go into this or that part either of England and as long as it remained in strong communion with Rome everything developed, the church developed and civilization developed but if it didn't, the church became backward and civilization went down the drain [24.01] under the force of terrible invasions from Pits and Angles and Scots and down south from Moslems and over from the east from Mongols and others. It's a perpetual miracle that the church is even there, but she's there as a great fighting force. But a fighting force concerned with doctrine, worship and a mode of living. Very public and social mode of living. And it's meant to have great influence in human society, the bonds of social classes and groups and all human activities. He lists them all the time, the activity of building, making laws, constructing roads, fashioning villages, Towns, burrows, governments, parliaments, laws, literature and all these things. That's the

accompaniment to civilization as we know it. And the church is meant to have a great influence in all that, animating it, giving it life. It's a situation that's centered on Christ himself.[25.00] But on Christ in all his dimensions, not in the isolation of someone comparable to historical figures from the past with say an inspiring message [25.11] That's how you read it in the papers sometime, "Jesus message is so simple and so on." They treat of him as if like he's Plato or Aristotle or Julius Caesar or Cicero. Somebody from the past, a lot of people are interested in and other people aren't interested in. Well that's an absolute parody on who Christ really is. So we must see Christ in all of his dimensions, not just in that isolated historical mode. But with Christ who is the perfection, the fullness of divine revelation about God and man in the universe. What a task that is for the hierarchical chiefs. No wonder they have to insist that they've been authorized by Christ to do this, otherwise people wouldn't accept it. No wonder they have to insist on the truth of him assisting them through the action of the Holy Spirit. No wonder they have to insist that the obligation on all is to listen, that is to hear and heed their voice as Christ's. [26.00] For this combat mission, to transmit the truth requires everything the hierarchs can give. And being still troubled, these are the bishops and priests linked with the bishops, being still troubled as everybody is with the inheritance of original sin, they will be tempted to sidestep their mission and these two monsignors, that's what happened.

{Original Sin and The Church}

The whole hierarchical transmission has broken down, that's all. Why has it broken down? One reason is you see everybody involved in the hierarchical structure is still under the influence of original sin and can be frightened and so on by what he's got to do. They will be

tempted by the reluctance of many to be taught. People look at them and they don't want to hear what the bishops say. Even by their positive dissent from what they teach. As soon as the pope issued this encyclical, the day it came out 750 theologians in America said "Rubbish, we don't accept it." Hadn't even read it. [27.00] They just knew basically what it said and they rejected it. Then bishops writing letters supporting the pope's teaching seemed to support in part one of their letters and in part two they seemed to give a way out of it. As though they were pressurized by all those very vocal theologians. So they until the holy see had to command many bishops, bishop's conferences to rewrite the letters that they'd written. So it is a difficult situation we're involved in. We still haven't reached the central point of our discourse. They will be tempted as they say by the positive dissent from what they teach. Tempted to be timid and embarrassed even as the lay faithful are also tempted. They will be tempted to timidity and embarrassment by what's now called the academic magisterium of scholars especially the biblical ones with the now popular appeal to the [28.01] Loyal, if you want, and responsible dissent. So that's how it often depicted. Now there is an alternative magisterium made up of scholars, especially scripture scholars, and religious superiors and other big wigs in seminaries and so on. And one of their war cries is we have the right to dissent. Of course the dissent must be loyal, nuanced and responsible. Sounds important doesn't it. Sounds real. Let's see. The great enterprise bogs down. Well what's going on?

{Sharpening of Understanding}

That makes it so necessary to in .. to sharpen our understanding of authority and infallibility and the allied matters. It's the breakdown of hierarchical governance of the church [29.02] through dissent that's

turning the ecclesiastical and supernatural order into a religious replica of the social and political order. So in the beginning we said there's a great avalanche or tidal wave of opposition. But now we see how it's entering into the ecclesial order itself. It's not just from communism or anything like that or materialism of capitalism, as the pope's been saying in his recent encyclical. It's getting right into the structured life of the church itself. Well, these priests explained, that in America, the idea of dissent is very so common and so approved of as it can be approved of in the secular political social order, that they almost automatically transfer it into the ecclesial order. So I just put down a few of the thoughts. A high court judge, for example, legitimately dissents from the judgement of his brother judges. There's nothing wrong in that. It is an appeal [30.02] and a half a dozen judges listen to the appeal, say in a murder trial, and five of the judges that the lower court's decision was correct and the sixth judge doesn't, then he dissents from his brother judges. He gives a dissenting judgement. He's not doing anything wrong. He's doing something very good. Could be very good. I don't quite know, of course, what does go on say in caucus and other bodies like that. Where principles, policies and programs are forged in the heat of discussion. But loyal dissent does play a part up to a point, at any rate, in such discussions. If we had Mr. Hawke in here he'd tell us what he thought about it. Obviously political parties dissent from the accepted and current orthodoxy of other parties. Even of current practices in country, where it's not a question of absolute morality [end of side 1].

Side 2

.. is the Universal, episcopal magisterium from Pentecost or from the time that the apostles died. The magisterium is coming down from

the apostles. ... What's been universally taught sorry I must read that again. Basically it is the universal episcopal magisterium from then on. What's been universally taught by the ordinary magisterium, that is by the everyday teaching action and the dispersed teaching action (chosen) in Jerusalem that's out off the coast at (Midah). It's up there at Antioch, it's over there at Endessa. It's up in Asia Minor. It's over there in Phillip Heights down in Colossus its down in Corinth, its over in Rome. It's over in Lyons, its over in Taragossa. It's up there here and there. Now the bit of (the old) teaching dispersed. But they're all teaching the same thing. And what they teach, as coming from the apostles, is infallibly taught by them, as a body. Some people don't know that. That is [1.00] by the presence and assistance of the spirit it cannot be wrong as being divinely protected. Basic is the extraordinary magisterium of the bishop teachers. That is as gathered together in councils recognize the pope, by the pope as ecumenical. That is involving the whole church.

{Divine Assistance Without Infallibility}

It's infallible when it wants to be. That is when defining the embattled faith. Now the bishops did not want to exercise the sacred magisterium at the level where they would need and receive the infallible help of the Holy Spirit because there was no need to. But people say "aha, it's not infallible, therefore it could all be wrong" you see. Alright, you go back to the kindergarten and learn what the meaning of grammar is. The fact that it's not infallible doesn't mean there's no help there. It means the assistance given is at a lower level because that was all that was needed. The teaching action is the highest possible teaching action of the Catholic Church this side of defining dogma. You could they were so simplistic at times, they think

well if it's not one thing is the dead opposite. [2.00]

It's not infallible that Noah's ark could be wrong. Say well you must be crazy. The beatification of a person is not an infallible act by the church. Well who could say it could be wrong. Not infallible. It's got mighty assistance from the Holy Spirit. The act of canonizing is infallible. Some don't know those things. Now the recent council didn't chose to define any more of the faith but to give it a massive expression. For you might say immediate pastoral views. They could have defined and then been given the supreme assistance but they didn't need that topmost assistance. Basic is the pope's charism of so defining the revealed mind and will of God. Matters of faith to be believed and morals to be acted upon in view of salvation. That the same infallibility Christ has willed the entire episcopate under the pope to have for the defining his mind and will, he, the pope has. More basic is the goal of this divinely authorized and assisted magisterium, namely, the absolute certainty and unity of faith for the entire believing church [3.02] and forever. It'll be exactly the same the day Our Lord appears on Earth, when he manifests himself. It'll be exactly the same as was transmitted on Pentecost Sunday. But there might be a hundred more dogmas than we have now, that is, there might be a hundred aspects of the divine revelation that have reached such a clear consciousness in the mind of the church, that they long to and do declare them to be dogmas. Everybody thinks that Our Lady's role in the world's and church's history will be defined as dogma one day, her universal mediation, but the church won't do it. Because she doesn't have enough consciousness of exactly what it means. She knows it's true, but they pressurize the Holy see, but they "no, the time's not right." We are not perfectly certain yet what it involves. When we are, then we might define it,

especially if it's attacked. The assumption wasn't attacked but see how long it took before they defined the assumption. [4.00] Everybody knew it, but these things have their own special time to be brought up to the very highest possible level of proclamation by the church. So belief is the goal, magisterium is the means. But on this basis of the infallible teaching and believing, what has come to be more actual, all these things are true what I said, but they're not so pressing. More pressing than actual is the exercise of the pope's ordinary magisterium and the religious assent we give to it. First we must exorcise, that's what you do when somebody's possessed by the devil, from our midst the idea that the papal magisterium is an imposition to be reluctantly agreed to and not more than is necessary and dissented from if there are serious consciencious reasons for doing so.

{Dissent}

Now Father Del O'Shea writing in the Brisbane Leader had that as a universal theme song of every page that he wrote week after week. [5.01] He's been removed from it now. But every week he said it. It explained the church's teaching and you'd say that's not bad Bill. Then always in the last paragraph but if any of the faithful had serious underlying consciencious reasons they may dissent from it. Now if you that over and over every week after a while people think that's part of catholic teaching. Because how would he otherwise be getting away with it. What do we do now to finish off? By golly it's getting on isn't it? This is based on what? It's based on the subjectivist notion of truth, especially of revelation. Where does it come from, very quickly? Protestantism has resulted in today's modernism. Modernism is subjectivism, that is, the giving of prime importance to so called religious experience of God and hailing it as revelation. Expressions of

this revealing experience can be inspiring but they don't oblige anybody. [6.00] Obligatory formulations or revelation are an imposition. That's what modernists say. Moreover they canonize formulations of revelation. They canonize the experience of earlier generation. God reveals to us in an ongoing fashion and so on. You may have heard it. If not you will. It's rampant and it moonshine but it acts like a drug creating euphoria. And subjecting everything; doctrine, worship, life, remember the three phases of the church, to the one test of whether it's in harmony with contemporary experience. Lesley Druitt wrote a book in which he said, "the doctrine of the trinity does not make an impact on the contemporary experience of modern man. Therefore it's to be put into limbo." That's modernism. Hence we get the plethora of questions; How do you feel about Women Priests, Married Priests, Contraception and eventually the blessed trinity? [7.00] As if it made any difference what you did feel. With this approach you can see the antipathy to being taught in obligatory fashion by the Holy See, they get very angry. People subject all documents to their own appraisal as being in a superior position. They might even agree with much of what the pope says, but only because they approve of the reasons and arguments. The reserve the right to dissent on serious consciencious grounds. Nearly always reduced to their not being convinced by the arguments the pope used for this or that teaching. My foot. They are introducing, what are they doing? Two things, they are introducing as well the dissent that can be of serious affairs of society, science and university into the church, well we saw that. Now there's another point that they're going on about. They are even subtly misusing a perfectly legitimate possibility in the church itself. In what are called particular judgements. You can ask me after tea if you don't

understand it. Particular judgements that don't affect the church as believing and directed according the mind and will of Christ. [8.03] It is possible that somebody is convinced he has evidence that would nullify one or other of these judgements. It has happened, the protocol is clear. You present your evidence to the authority, making the judgement and abide by their decision. You never call the authority into question. You're not dissenting. You're not a judge on a high court of the church tribunal where a dissenting opinion could be quite proper. You're strictly unable in dealing with a particular judgement because you have contrary evidence, presumably not known to the authority, to abide by the decision. All this is well known in theology books. But it has nothing to do with dissenting from what dissenters are pleased to call non-infallible teachings of the church and the pope. Nothing to do with it. They love to imply that these non-infallible teachings are presented somewhat tentatively by the pope. So that superior minds in assessing them could easily discover flaws or at least be unconvinced. What an insult to the church. Non-infallible simply means that a teaching doesn't have because it doesn't need [9.01] the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit. Our Lord doesn't over assist. Divine assistance isn't a replacement or substitute for human endeavor. The pope, say in the humane vitae drama, has to find out the truth and be convinced that the doctrine against contraception, which was never in question, did apply in the new cases being considered. See there were four new cases that haven't been thought of before. So the pope wanted to make sure that the dogma, the doctrine concerning contraception, applied. He took four years to make up his mind. So psychologically he studied, got advice, thought, prayed, until he was quite clear in his mind. Perfectly aware because the church had taught

him that the Holy Spirit was helping him to reach that stage of mind. He didn't experience it, he might have experienced it, but he doesn't have to. He knows by faith that that is going on, just as I know it by faith. Our faith, the pope's faith and mind's exactly the same. You're the Holy Father, you're being assisted. I'll pray for you that you get more assisted. [10.00] Thankyou. So through the teaching, he knows he's being assisted. Only then could he say so, quite aware through the teaching of the church, that he'd been assisted by the Holy Spirit. He could have inserted one or more infallible declarations of the truth into the encyclical. In fact there's a new book out in Rome, which says that he did. but not only is the doctrine infallible, which a lot of people hold is certain, but that the statement of it in that encyclical is infallible. I find it hard to believe that, but there's a big book being written saying that it is so. Then if he did want to do it that way, he'd have had the topmost assistance, but he generally doesn't need it. He doesn't need it, to condemn say abortion, since the human intelligence can see quite clearly that abortion's murder of one who's not only innocent but helpless. You don't need the special or top assistance of the Holy Spirit to say that. Intelligence can see it. It's a crime in the phantom, it's an unspeakable crime. Dido with regard to contraception its intrinsically evil, it can be clearly appreciated by the mind.[11.03] But under the assaulted emotion and passion, the mind of fallen man can and does call evil good hence the help from on high. There we are. Backtracking to make sure the opening questions are dealt with so you don't go home with something still bothering you. So in any case at all, ... , Inspired or infallible, which comes first? There you are you can see from what we've said, that that is inspired by the Holy Spirit. And therefore as a consequence, seeing as its primary author is God, it is infallible by

its very nature, there can't possibly be a single mistake in sacred scripture. Now if you think there is, St Augustine's principles are correct, he says that we might have the wrong text. God hasn't guaranteed that the text will be transmitted with absolute perfection [12.03] so sometimes they found out that a text has been wrongly transmitted or we may have explained it incorrectly. If you thought that God made the world in six days; Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, well there's no skin off your nose if you thought that way. But nowadays nobody holds that except what are called the very, very strict creation fundamentalists. It doesn't mean, Moses didn't mean that when he wrote it you see. He meant it as a dramatic manner of discussing or teaching God's creation of the universe. Because to give great prominence to the Sabbath rest. So he had God, or he showed that we are imitators of God, made in his image and likeness. And so we labor in the universe that he labored to create. We labor to bring it to the goals that he intended. We can see it'd be crass materialism to think that wow Monday was all over and God said, what'll I do on Tuesday see. [13.02] That is called nervous or wooden interpretation of sacred scripture. Anyone that's that one. Now then I said what about the Vatican Council 2, was that inspired. The answer, no its not inspired. Nothing is inspired although the church uses the word inspiration in dealing with the action of the Holy Spirit with regard to us personally. We have to be inspired. Spiro, Spira, simply means breath. So the Spirit breaths into our will to move our wills to do what he wants us to do. We mightn't do it, but he'll do it. But Inspiration with a capital I is the word we're using, talking about. That only applies to scriptures, things written, that are therefore called sacred, sometimes canonical, because they're in a canon, a very fixed list. So the sacred

and canonical scriptures are a treasure beyond belief. Their chief and primary author is God. The human writers are not secretaries or [14.02] automatons or robots, they really wrote them as secondary authors, so the mystery consists in the conjunction of the two. Now the Second Vatican Council has been declared because they asked the bishops and they asked Pope Paul what is the right way to consider it. And so a special note was put into the end of the document on the church as to the nature. Query has been made as to what is the theological qualification to be attached to the teaching put forward in the schema of the church. As is self-evident it's to be interpreted by the general rules known to all. Be whatever else it proposes, taking into account conciliar practice and the pastoral purpose of the present council, the sacred synod defined as binding on the church only those matters of faith and morals which it has expressly put forward as such. Whatever else it proposes as the teaching of the supreme magisterium of the church is to be acknowledged and accepted by each [15.02] and every member of the faithful according to the mind of the council which is clear from the subject matter, formulation, etc. So the general consensus is that the fathers didn't want to call upon the topmost level of the Holy Spirit whereby they would be infallible.

{Canonizing a Saint}

Infallible doesn't mean remember if the pope makes an infallible judgement, say he canonizes a saint. Now that's an infallible judgement, not only that that person's in heaven because that's been done when he was declared a blessed. But being, the judgement is that this is a person not only in heaven, not only heroically lived the life of the Catholic Church, the divine way of living, but did it in such a manner as to be an embodiment of the gospel of Christ worthy of imitation by

all the faithful around the world. Now that's pretty high level stuff isn't it. Now ... , the pope needs the divine assistance of infallibility. [16.02] It doesn't mean it's not wrong, it means it can't be wrong. There's a slight difference. Even if there was no infallibility of assistance, you'd say who's going to say the pope's wrong in declaring the person a saint. They've done so much hard work on it, so many miracles have been given, so you feel you could say it yourself. Well golly they are saying it aren't they. Sister Jamima dies or Mrs Kaputz dies and their saints in heaven before you can say Jack Robinson now. I heard that, I heard a woman who was the mother of two priests who concelebrated the mass for her funeral, and I heard her put in like this, and so when I , her name was Patricia, and so with angels, archangels, thrones and dominations, the powers and Pat. We honor you and sing holy, holy, holy. She was in among the angels see. And then we ask you through the intercession of the blessed virgin, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, all the saints, and Pat. [17.00] Anyway, the point is, to remember that infallibility is like the cloud that you see outside. The cloud is just the visible part of a great, marvelous con of warm air, cold air, whichever it is. And the top of it gets to the cold region and you can see it. But it doesn't just stick up there on its own; you see infallibility's not just something stuck up there. It's the high point of a permanent continuous of assistance which is so subtle that it doesn't replace human endeavors, it requires human endeavors, so much so that they say, if the pope for example decided to declare infallibly tomorrow the doctrine about Mary's mediation and says "Oh well I haven't done much reading on it, but never mind I'll do it on Our Lady", he'd be infallible, but the possibility is he'd commit a mortal sin of imprudence. He should have done more homework on it. He'd be infallible. He

couldn't possibly be wrong. [18.00] But he shouldn't've done it like that. But no pope ever does it, they over do it if anything. They sent out, when they did the Assumption declaration, two questions to all the bishops of the world, and I've seen the volumes. Huge volumes like that worth of questions and the answers. Only two questions; Is the doctrine of the Assumption definable as having been revealed? Not just true, but having been revealed by God. And is it the right time to do it? Well it was 99.5% said yes it is a doctrine defined or revealed by God and can be defined and about 98% said yeah and we think it's a jolly good idea to define it too. So we asked every bishop and the bishops photographed all the papal. Do we all of us here now have we all held that Our Lady's been ascended into heaven? Most of the people thought these bishops were nuts see, (what did you write all that for), it's obvious. ... Now you're talking That's what the bishops were supposed to ask; [19.00] Does everybody in the church entrusted to you hold this? Anyway, so that's assisted by the Holy Spirit, the highest action of the teaching authority this side of infallibility. But remember the infallibility generally only covers a sentence or a paragraph. So the paragraphs and the canons of the council of Trent and the council of Avignon are all regarded as infallibly defined. That's the infallible definition of the catholic religion because it would have to be under such assault and attack from the protestant revolt that they had to hammer it out and then they defined it. So that's defined faith infallibly assisted. This is explained faith magnificently assisted up to the highest level. Here are the councils from the early days of the church. All the ecumenical councils. And all the great definitions of faith here, they're all definitions, all infallibly assisted. [20.00] The Encyclical on the Humane Vitae they make a decision, the doctrine is infallible, that

contraception is an intrinsic evil, has been held always in the church and taught everywhere until about 1960 when some people began to call it into question. Now the doctrine's been taught everywhere for a long time. It means it must be, it must be part of the apostolic teaching and is therefore infallible. That's how they do it. Then the pope could chose to define a particular statement of it or application of it. And most people say he didn't do it there's a big book out says he certainly did because the manner is clear. In the church's cannon law it says nothing is to be held to be infallibly declared unless it is perfectly clear that it is, otherwise there'd be something running round with his head poked out of his mouth. The Holy Spirit was assisting him up to the level of infallibility. But that's overdoing it, we don't need it. [21.00] But that's how, I didn't pick out a particular point but this priest has written a big book, and the present pope has given him a great public intonium, saying that's a marvelous book you've written. But some things are made a little doubtful at times and I think that was the only other question so ...

{Questions from Audience}

No because it wasn't, it wasn't done like that. The Vatican One was done in the manner of previous councils whereby they would take for example the one that winds up with that definition of a papal infallibility. It says this is the dogmatic constitution, well yeah. The first dogmatic constitution on the church of Christ. And it gives the, .. A lot of it, a lot of it for example is simply statement of historical fact. [22.02] That doesn't come under the rule that whatever they would state the catholic truth, that's regarded as all define doctrine. That's taken for granted by all theologians that that was defined doctrine whereas this one they said explicitly that they were not setting out to define

doctrine. You see the difference is generally speaking, not always, if the catholic religion was under assault, as it has been since Pentecost Sunday, but you see since Pentecost Sunday for 300 years there were no, there were no, extraordinary acts of the magisterium. All the bishops taught was what the apostles taught for them in the common kitty, they all taught it and got their heads burnt for doing it. It was all infallibly taught and infallibly held. The Holy Spirit enabled the faithful to hold it infallibly, they couldn't possibly be wrong. And he assisted the bishops scattered and acting in the ordinary day by day fashion [23.03] in their common witness to what the apostles said to be infallible, they couldn't possibly be wrong. And if you read them they always make the distinction. This has been handed down to us in this church or this is my opinion or this is what somebody else thinks of it with regard to but this point is the apostolic tradition. But they knew perfectly well what they were doing. Now in 325 when Arias started the great riot in the church against Christ as being coequal with his Father, which was held by everybody, then the bishops were gathered together. And then they set out to define, you see define simply means you get your pencil and if the doctrine is greatly won you say well that's everything we know about Jesus, there it is there; now let's get to the kernel of the thing. There are a thousand things they say about him, but what is the main thing that's being attacked? That he's coequal with his father so we'll write that down very carefully. Jesus Christ is the [24.01] coeternal son of his father and he has one and the same substance, the divine substance in reality that his father has, he has. And the Arians were stymied you see. They defined it, that is, they put, they put a line around it so you could see it. Like, it's like being a camera when you see a film. The camera can't cope with seeing things that are down there

and down here. So sometimes if the camera wants to show you us down on our knees, but the people in the foreground are fuzzy, so the camera has to refocus so you see the people in the foreground so they are defining their features, you know they're there. But you can see them but you say has he got blue eyes or has he a crooked nose or whatever you see. You zoom in so defining a face is a bit of zooming in on the face, thank you. You might go down in history now having contributed to the understanding of doctrine. That's reasonably clear now, alright. That's the question you asked. [25.01]. But the thing always is, you see, is to avoid what's called, in the olden days, legalism with regard to teaching. Legalism means do I have to accept this as faith? Say yes. Do I have to accept this as faith? No, right, don't bother about it. That's legalism, that's a complete misunderstanding of the church's law. That you are obliged to hold something when something is defined. You must hold it with divine and catholic faith. And the rest, and the church says you must hold the rest too. But it's at a lower level that's all. The religious ascent and it binds in conscience. We are even bound, all of us Catholics, to hold what the theologians commonly teach. Even if the church has not spoken about it. See there are a lot of things that theologians all agree about, but have never been taught at a higher level. But the fact that the theologians are all teaching it, the church knows perfectly well they're doing it. She ratifies that. [26.00] There are a lot of things like that, there's the Sunday mass obligation. That's taught by all as being an obligation. But you'd find it hard to pinpoint it in a magisterial document of the church. You don't have to, because it's taught everywhere, and the church knows it's being taught and doesn't reprimand anybody for teaching it. So she is virtually teaching it, and we all have to hold it. You're not free not to hold it. So,

but then you see, that's the other point. Many act as if the holding of something taught is a nuisance, that, do we have to? You say, you must be an ass. The mind from one point of view is a great big pit of darkness with regard to these things. And here's the torch coming in to light up everything, and you say do I have to have any more like him? See how silly that would be. The teaching is the illumination of the mind of the faithful. So the catholic teaching is the same as your conscience. [27.00] They say now, if you have conscientious differences with the pope you can carry on. See but that's silly. But the teaching is our conscience. Cardinal Newman said up till the time of the magisterium of the church. The poor old human race had to get along on its conscience, that's all it had. Now that God has come in through this manner, he has illuminated the mind and now we know what is right and wrong, true and evil, true and erroneous. So you can't put a, you can't put a stick between the human conscience and the teaching of the church. It doesn't make any sense. I'm sure all those things will come out in the half a dozen documents that are due from the Holy See in the next short period. Any other questions now? yes Brian. Just a sec Brian. (All the documents coming up from the sacred congregation all these recons, Question no1 aren't they all read by the pope, approved by the pope, if they are approved by the pope, doesn't have anything to do with papal moral ... ? [28.00]

No the general position is that the pope is the teacher and the director or the ruler of the church. Now he therefore sets up instrumentalities whereby he carries out his mission. Sacred congregation of the doctrine of the faith is the major instrumentality whereby he carries out his mission of teaching the faithful. So they are entrusted with safeguarding the integrity and the purity of catholic

teaching. Now they get all kinds of requests to deal with this that or the other, sent to the pope. Or the pope can ask them straight out to do something. He entrusts them, they bring the document to him, he, that's after it's been through the closest possible scrutiny by the cardinals appointed by him, and all sorts of people round the world. And he puts his final stamp on it. And we all can say, this has been brought to the pope, who has read it, approved of it, and demanded an audited publication. So it's called an act of the pope, not a papal act. They make those little tiny distinctions. Then it depends, the pope can give it [29.02] solemn approval or ordinary approval. These are technical points, just indicating how important the document may or may not be. When you ask me is every single one of them required or requested by the pope, I don't honestly know. He gives them the work to do. It's unthinkable that they would do anything that they didn't check with him first otherwise they'd be wasting their time. They could ask him, look, we're getting so many requests, would you approve if we get cracking on a document dealing with the man on the moon? He might say "Mm alright, how much, you've got all that stuff there, alright you go ahead." He mightn't've thought of it himself. So I don't know that fine detail. But nothing in those sacred congregations would be infallibly declared. They would be, they would be, they would be declarations [30.00] concerning matters that have already been declared infallibly. For example there was one that got out on the nature of the church and the nature of the infallibility. All they did was to declare, that is to state clearly again what the church was already teaching, in view of the attacks being made by Kung, by those points. So the question of infallibility doesn't crop up there. Infallibility is a personal thing of the college of bishops or of the roman bishops. Not of

the agencies that he uses. And remember they don't, they don't, they don't act in the way many of theologians act or think. They think that unless something is declared infallibly it's more or less up for grabs and can be discussed. And the church says, that is completely wrong, you've got, you're whole mindset ...

[end of talk]